UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,675	12/17/2001	Isao Ota	111483	5111
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 02/26/201 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	ANGADI, MAKI A		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1792		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/015,675	OTA ET AL.	
ĺ	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MAKI A. ANGADI	1792	

	MAKI A. ANGADI	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second co	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	cowable if submitted in a separate, t will not be entered, or b) will	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>19-26</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowand	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Nadine G Norton/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments on page 5-8 of the reply with respect independent claims 19 and 22 asserting that the reference of Tastu, does not meet the pH limitations of these claims are not convincing. Tatsu describes a solution of the salt or salts of the rare earth or earths which is added continuously to the reaction medium in parallel with the basic solution (col.8, line 15-23) to achieve a pH that is greater than 5 but less than 10 (col.8, lines 3-7), therefore encompasses the range cited in independent claims 19 and 22. Tastu discloses that the polishing composition could be in the form of an aqueous suspension (col.5, lines 60-65, col.9, lines 21-23) or in the powder form (col.9, lines 28-30) and leads to a stable composition (col.10, lines 33-41) as illustrated in Examples 1-8 (cols.12-14) and with pH in the range of about 5-10 (col.3, lines 59-64, col.5, lines 60-65, claim 24).

Applicants' arguments on page 6 of the reply asserting that the pH disclosed by the reference of Tastu is for an intermediary reaction mixture and not a final abrasive are not convincing. Tastu discloses the process of introducing cerium into the reaction medium in the cerous state and is then oxidized to the ceric state and hence controlling the pH of the reaction medium (col.3, lines 31-64). The chemical composition of cerium-based polishing composition that includes cerium oxide is illustrated in Examples 1-8 and claim 17..